

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 8, 16, 17, 19 to 23, and 26 to 28 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, 16, and 26 to 28 are independent. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 8, 16, 18, 23, and 26 to 28 were rejected under §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,671,681 (Emens); and claims 2 to 6, 17 and 19 to 22 were rejected under §103 over Emens in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/01038090 (Starzl). As shown above, Applicant has amended the claims to define the invention with greater clarity. In view of these clarifications, withdrawal of the art rejections is respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 1 defines a computer-implemented method comprising obtaining a query for a database using one or more query generation rules. The database comprises elements; the elements comprise fields; and the one or more query generation rules obtain the query by incorporating, into the query, a selected element of the database and a selected field in the selected element. The method also includes generating a teaser that corresponds to the query, where the teaser comprises a textual description that includes at least one of the selected element and the selected field.

Claim 1 is thus directed to generating queries and teasers from a database (e.g., structured storage) having elements that include fields. For example, suppose a restaurant database contains elements (e.g., tables) with fields that include the name, cuisine, chef and address of restaurants. Suppose one restaurant is on "Persian Street" but there are no Persian restaurants by cuisine. If all of the terms in the database were used to generate a query, or even all of the terms

in a (joined) row pertaining to a single restaurant were indexed, a query on "Persian" would indicate that this restaurant database was relevant even if it contained no Persian restaurants. Claim 1 therefore generates the query using a selected element (e.g., restaurant) and field of the element (e.g., cuisine, in this example, Persian).

Furthermore, claim 1 is directed to generating a teaser comprising a textual description that includes at least the selected element and selected field. For example, if cuisine names of the above-noted restaurant database have been indexed, then a teaser can be generated having the form: "Find <cuisine name> restaurants in your area by visiting our restaurant database." Thus, when a user queries on "French", the invention will match this term to a cuisine name that has been obtained from the restaurant database. The invention will then present the teaser "Find French restaurants in your area by visiting our restaurant database."

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1, particularly with respect to obtaining a query for a database, where the database comprises elements, the elements comprise fields, and the query is obtained by incorporating, into the query, a selected element of the database and a selected field in the selected element.

More specifically, Emens addresses the question of how to identify past queries to a search engine that are conceptually similar to a given query. The concept behind Emens is that queries are conceptually similar if they return similar results. Thus, Emens teaches that queries related to a given query can be determined on the basis of overlap of returned search results. That is, if items returned on the basis of query A overlap with items returned on the basis of query B to a greater extent than results for any other query, then in this sense, query B is the

most closely related query the system has seen to query A. Presenting query B to the user is a way to show the issuer of query A alternative ways to explore the information space that might be useful. In the Emens example, a user who issues a query for "boat dealers" may be interested in knowing that the results of that search overlap to a great extent with the results for a prior query ("Sail Boat Dealers and North America"). By storing these past queries and the items that match them, query-query relationships are established.

Emens, however, obtains its queries through searches of documents, not databases having a structure of elements and fields. Accordingly, Emens is not understood to disclose or to suggest obtaining a query for a database comprising elements, where the elements comprise fields and the query is obtained by incorporating, into the query, a selected element of the database and a selected field in the selected element.

Emens is also not understood to disclose or to suggest generating a teaser that corresponds to the query, where the teaser comprises a textual description that includes at least one of the selected element and the selected field. In this regard, page 3 of the Office Action alleges that the teasers of claim 1 correspond to the previous queries obtained via Emens' process. However, as defined in amended claim 1, the teasers comprises a textual description that includes at least one of the selected element and the selected field from the database. Emens alleged counterparts to claim 1's teasers do not contain database elements and fields, much less the same ones used to generate the query.

Starzl is not understood to disclose or to suggest anything that would remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Emens vis-à-vis claim 1. Claim 1 is thus believed to be patentable.

The remaining independent claims, namely claims 8, 16, and 26 to 28, each includes generating a query and a teaser in the manner of claim 1. Accordingly, these claims are also believed to be patentable.

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-521-7896.


Applicant : Andrew R. Golding
Serial No. : 09/927,015
Filed : August 9, 2001
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 10984-601001
Client Ref.: P-272

Please apply any fees or credits due in this case, which are not already covered by check,
to Deposit Account 06-105, referencing 10984-601001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 20, 2005



Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906